Exhibit B

	18J6GULS	•
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	x	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	v.	10 CR 56(RJS)
. 5	JASON GOLDFARB,	
. 6	Defendant.	
7	x	
8		New York, N.Y. August 19, 2011
9		10:00 a.m.
10	Before:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11		- T. 7.77 N.T
12	HON. RICHARD J. SULI	
13	·	District Judge
14	APPEARANCES PREET BHARARA	
15	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York	
16	RICHARD C. TARLOWE Assistant United States Attorney	
17	MICHAEL L. SOSHNICK	
18	Attorney for Defendant	
19		
20	•	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		• •

(In open court; case called)

THE LAW CLERK: Appearing on behalf of the government?

MR. TARLOWE: Richard Tarlowe for the government.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Tarlowe.

For the defense?

MR. SOSHNICK: Good morning, your Honor. Michael L. Soshnick.

THE COURT: Mr. Soshnick, good morning. Mr. Goldfarb, good morning to you. I want to say good morning to the others who are here. I am sure there are friends and family members, former clients of Mr. Goldfarb and others who are interested. All are welcome. This is a public courtroom. Everyone is welcomed to be here. I am sure you are here to support Mr. Goldfarb. I am sure your presence means a great deal to him. Thank you for being here. Many of you wrote letters and I read them all. So I want to thank you for taking the time to do that. Such letters can be helpful to help the Court get a sense of the individual being sentenced. I thank you for taking the time to do taking the time to do that.

Let me say initially I apologize we're getting a late start. I think I have a reputation for punctuality. In this case I was a little late getting up here because I really did want to both collect and review again some of the materials that had been submitted. So I don't lightly make lawyers or others wait in court. I know you all have things to do and

important appointments and other things that are important to you and rightly so. That is the reason for the delay. So I apologize.

We're here for sentencing. Mr. Goldfarb pled guilty before me back in April, April 21. I want to go over with the parties what I received in connection with sentencing and if I have left something out then by all means let me know. First of all, I reviewed the plea transcript from April 21. I have reviewed of course the presentence report from the Probation Department, which is dated August 5th, and it is about a 30-page report with the recommendation of the Probation Department. I have reviewed Mr. Soshnick's submission, which is dated August 11th. That submission is just 16 pages, single-spaced. It also includes a number of attachments, including approximately 50 plus letters or so as well as also a report, psychiatric report, psychological summary I should say, which I am sure we'll hear more about today.

Then I have received and reviewed the government's sentencing submission, which is a nine-page, double-spaced submission dated August 12th. It also includes a number of exhibits, which are transcripts of recordings that were made during the course of the investigation, during the wiretap, and some or most of them were played at the trial of Mr. Goffer and others. So I have reviewed those.

I then have an August 17th submission. It is a

one-page letter from Mr. Soshnick. It principally attaches a letter from Mr. Goldfarb to the Court as well as six additional letters from friends, family members and clients. So I have reviewed all those as well.

That is what I reviewed in connection with sentencing. In addition, I presided over the trial of Zvi Goffer, Emanuel Goffer and Michael Kimelman. So I have certainly heard a lot of evidence and testimony related to this scheme that is the subject of this sentencing today. So I am certainly familiar with the case.

Is there anything else I have left out, Mr. Soshnick?

MR. SOSHNICK: No, your Honor. You've been very
thorough and you included everything that was submitted to you
on behalf of my client.

THE COURT: Mr. Tarlowe, anything from the government's perspective that I may have left out?

MR. TARLOWE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's start with the presentence report. The presentence report is dated August 5th and I think it is very clear from your submission, Mr. Soshnick, that you received a copy of the report. There was a prior report I guess as well?

MR. SOSHNICK: Yes, your Honor.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

THE COURT: So you've reviewed this report with your client?

MR. SOSHNICK: Yes. I reviewed the prior report and formulated objections and I reviewed the subsequent report with my client. That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: And the objections that you've made, some

THE COURT: And the objections that you've made, some of them I think were already addressed in the report and so it seems to me the only objections that remain relate to the amount -- tell me what objections remain.

MR. SOSHNICK: Your Honor, we're satisfied with the manner in which the Probation Department resolved the various objections that I set forth in a letter to Probation, which I copied the government on.

THE COURT: So that is my understanding as well.

Mr.Tarlowe, have you received a copy of the presentence report?

MR. TARLOWE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the government have any objections to it?

MR. TARLOWE: No, we don't, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's start then with the guidelines calculation for those who may not be familiar with how sentencings work. There are a number of factors that the Court is required to consider. We went over what those factors are. One of those factors are the United States sentencing guidelines. An edition comes out each year, a little different than the year before. The point of this book is really to

provide some guidance to courts in imposing a sentence. These guidelines are advisory. They are not mandatory. There was a time when they were mandatory, but they are no longer mandatory. A Court is obliged to consider these guidelines. I don't are to follow them, but I have to consider them.

For each crime and type of crime, there is a chapter in this book that a Court is directed to go to and make certain findings and upon making those findings assign a certain number of points and it becomes a fairly technical and arithmetical exercise. But the point of the guidelines is to try to make sure that people who are similarly situated are treated roughly the same in the system of justice with the recognition that wildly disparate desperate sentences undermine people's confidence in the system of justice and it is on some levels unfair recognizing of course that no people are exactly the same or ever exactly similarly situated.

So we're going to spend a few moments going through these guidelines. It can be technical or at least it can sound technical, but in this case I think it is fairly straightforward and simple. I don't think there is any disputes what the guidelines are in this case.

MR. SOSHNICK: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: So the guidelines calculation picks up on page 12 of the presentence report. Mr. Goldfarb pled guilty to two counts, Count One and Count Three. Those counts are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

grouped together under the sentences guidelines. According to guidelines there is a base offense level of eight because this crime involved insider trading. So pursuant to Section 2B1.4 specifically 1.4(a), eight levels are the offense level. Because this offense involved profits of a little over a million dollars from trades made by Mr. Goldfarb's codefendants, the offense level is increased by 16 pursuant to Section 2B1.1(b)(1)(l) and 2B1.4(b)(1). So that deals in adjusted offense level 24. Because Mr. Goldfarb pled quilty in advance of trial, accepted responsibility for this crime, three levels are taken away, they are substracted. That yields a total offense level of 21. Mr. Goldfarb has no prior convictions so he is in criminal history category I, which is the lowest criminal history category. As a result the guidelines range in this case given the offense level of 21, criminal history category of six the guidelines range is 37 to 46 months. So that is the guidelines calculation in the view of the Sentencing Commission that is a sentence that will be appropriate for a person who has those characteristics and for a crime that involved those specific facts.

That is only one of a variety of factors that the Court has to consider. So I assume that is where we are going to go now and talk about those other factors. Many of those factors were referred to and discussed both in Mr. Soshnick's submissions and in the letters of friends and family members.

2.0

So, Mr. Soshnick, I am happy to hear from you. And read your letters and all the attachments. Anything you would like to add, I am certainly happy to hear.

MR. SOSHNICK: Your Honor, as you pointed out my client is someone who obviously has no prior criminal history of any kind of nature whatsoever. He is an attorney and he has always loved being an attorney. He has represented many clients, all of whom have appreciated the very valuable services he has provided for them. Some of those clients are here today and actually want to address the Court.

I would indicate to the Court that unlike the others who figured in this conspiracy, my client was not motivated by greed but rather by need. He was involved in a situation where his father had a failing women's clothing store in Brooklyn and his mother was diagnosed with cancer. My client's father came to my client and told my client that he needed financial assistance.

THE COURT: When was that? That is repeated in virtually every letter. It is repeated in psychological report. It is in your letter, but it is never quite specific as to when all these facts took place.

MR. SOSHNICK: 2007, your Honor.

THE COURT: 2007. When in 2007?

MR. SOSHNICK: My client tells me it was April or March in 2007.

THE COURT: This went on well into 2008, right?

MR. SOSHNICK: The trades that were referable to my

client, for which my client received the aggregate sum of

\$38,500 occurred in 2007 and just a little bit into 2008. That
is correct.

THE COURT: There were other certainly conversations, including intercepted conversations, that indicate that this was a scheme that was going on into 2008 and there were plans to do more trades and much more profitable insider trades.

MR. SOSHNICK: Your Honor, my client informs me that he was paying for medical coverage for his mother in connection with her cancer diagnosis in 2007 and 2008. I want to just indicate to the Court that unlike others who went on lavish vacations and who spent a great deal of money on acquiring personalty, my client did not keep a nickel, a dime or a penny of the \$32,500 he received. All of it went to his parents in connection with his father's failing business and his mother's medical issues. I think that puts him in a position that is quite different from the other individuals who participated in this conspiracy. I think that point has been highlighted and rightly so.

Your Honor, I would like to also bring to the Court's attention that my client never traded a single stock in his life. Certainly during the entirety of this conspiracy he did not trade any stocks. I know that on the wiretaps, and I have

2.0

reviewed the transcripts, he is heard talking about making millions and making enough money to retire, but I think that is part and parcel of his mental condition. I believe that that is evidence of his mania and grandiosity and Dr. Kirwin who has written an extensive psychological summary can speak in greater details about that.

I also want the Court to know that I personally participated with my client at two lengthy proffer sessions at the United States Attorney's Office. Mr. Tarlowe was present for both of those sessions as well as Mr. Fish and agents of the FBI. During those sessions, my client did everything he could possibly do to assist the government in getting convictions with respect to those who were going to trial.

THE COURT: That was when?

MR. SOSHNICK: I don't have the exact dates. Perhaps
Mr. Tarlowe has the exact dates.

THE COURT: Well, are they before or after Mr. Goldfarb's guilty plea?

MR. SOSHNICK: They were before his guilty plea, your Honor.

MR. TARLOWE: Your Honor, the proffers were approximately a month or six weeks before the trial and probably a week or two before Mr. Goldfarb's guilty plea.

THE COURT: Relatively late in the date, right, Mr. Soshnick?

MR. SOSHNICK: Your Honor, I want to be clear, I came into this --

THE COURT: I am not faulting you or anyone. I am just asking about the timing.

MR. SOSHNICK: I understand, your Honor. I came into this case late in the day and the prior attorney was told by Mr. Goldfarb that Mr. Goldfarb's desire was to cooperate with the government, and I wasn't present for a prior proffer session. But Mr. Goldfarb tells me that he did present himself and he spoke with an FBI agent and assistant United States attorney Reed Brodsky well before I came into this case.

So the two proffer sessions where I personally attended and participated were as Mr. Tarlowe said about six weeks before the trial and a few weeks before my client entered his guilty plea but shortly after his arrest when he retained counsel in this case. It is my understanding that he immediately told his prior counsel that he wanted to cooperate, accept responsibility, make amends for the wrongs he had done in this case and that he did in fact attend a proffer session with Mr. Hoffman and assistant United States Attorney Reed Brodsky is a and an FBI agent.

So I don't want the Court to think that this was an idea that came late to my client. This was his initial reaction to the situation. His initial reaction was to join Team U.S.A. right away. The government I think felt that they

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

had sufficient proof against Zvi Goffer and his brother and they were not necessarily interested in allowing him to cooperate. When I entered the case, I implored Mr. Fish and Mr. Tarlowe to allow my client to proffer because I believed that my client was uniquely qualified to cooperate in the sense that he had dealt with the attorneys at Ropes & Gray as well as Zvi Goffer and Zvi Goffer's brother Emanuel, where the cooperator Bryan St. Arlas had only dealt with another attorney at Ropes & Gray, Mr. Arthur Cutillo, and my client. I said my client can close the loop and explain to you what was happening with respect to Zvi Goffer and Emanuel Goffer, and also I indicated that he had in his possession an exhibit that was handwritten by Zvi Goffer that I thought might be important for the government to see and possibly utilize in its prosecution against the Goffer brothers.

Further, I indicated that my client had a safety deposit box and that there were certain records that were associated with that box that figure in this conspiracy that may be useful to the government in establishing guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. So the government agreed to allow these proffer sessions to go forward. And also during these proffer sessions my client answered particular questions that were put to him by the government prosecutors and the FBI agents who were present with respect to certain nuances of the conspiracy and I honestly believe that he provided assistance. He was

.22

willing to testify but the government decided not to have him testify. Even during the course of the trial, I indicated that if the government wanted my client to testify as a rebuttal witness if the government believed that to be necessary and appropriate, my client would make himself available on a telephone call.

So I want to be clear my client's initial instinct was to cooperate and accept responsibility when he was arrested and he discussed that with prior counsel and there was an early proffer session. When I was hired my whole focus was on having my client cooperate and he did. I understand that the government has decided not to give a 5K letter in this case and I respect the government's decision. However, I believe that pursuant to the Second Circuit holding in United States v. Fernandez, the Court should take into consideration the fact that my client cooperated and did provide tangible assistance to the government in obtaining convictions in this case.

Further, I want the Court to know that my client's SEC counsel is present here in the courtroom and I did attach a letter from him to my submission.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SOSHNICK: My client is continuing to cooperate with that federal agency. So I think that the Fernandez case absolutely entitles the Court to credit my client for the cooperation both with the U.S. Attorney's Office and his

ongoing cooperation with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Of course my final point is that based upon my client's mental condition, the Court is absolutely entitled to sentence my client below the guideline range. There is a very detailed psychological summary that was attached to my submission. I indicated in my submission that if the government wanted to challenge any portion of the psychological summary, we would like to have a hearing. Dr. Kirwin is present. I have discussed that with Mr. Tarlowe and he indicated he is not challenging any portion of the psychological summary and a hearing would not be necessary from his perspective. But if the Court wants sworn testimony, Dr. Kirwin is available for that purpose. If not Dr. Kirwin wants to speak at these proceedings and share her thoughts and her analysis with respect to Mr. Goldfarb and where he stands at the present time.

THE COURT: I don't think we need a hearing.

MR. SOSHNICK: Very well. So for all the reasons set forth in my submission, I don't believe a sentence of incarceration is necessary. I know that my client has learned a very, very dear lesson. I know that he has suffered greatly as a result of the mistakes that he made which, resulted in his involvement in this conspiracy. Most particularly he is no longer going to be a lawyer, a counselor, an attorney at law.

This is something that he absolutely loved. This is something that defined him professionally. This is a huge loss to him and I know that we all know lawyers who don't like being lawyers who regret ever having gone to law school. This is not one of those people. Mr. Goldfarb is somebody who loved practicing law for from the very first day and I know that there is a whole hole in his heart as a result of the fact that this disbarment is imminent. And of course the embarrassment that he has caused himself, family, friends and colleagues is something that he feels every single day.

So as my client has indicated in his letter to you, your Honor, he has already been punished more severely than anyone can possibly punish him with respect to imposing a formal sentence. I recognize that your considerations is general deterrence, and this is something that concerns me greatly because I know you have to take that into consideration. All I can say to you is that my client is absolutely agreeable to disgorging the \$32,500 that he received as his share of the proceeds of this conspiracy.

Frankly, your Honor, if he were punished based upon the offense he committed and not held accountable for the profits of the Goffer brothers, we would be looking at a guideline range that would afford the Court the opportunity to give Probation, he would be in Zone A in this case considering the fact that my client has no prior criminal history. But I

recognize that we entered into a plea agreement that knowledges those 16 additional points and the profits of the Goffer brothers. But I think in fairness when the Court fashions a sentence in this case, it should recognize that the only money my client received was the \$32,500 and all of it went to help his parents, and in particular his mother who unfortunately got the bad news of the cancer diagnosis.

There are many people who would like to speak and who know Mr. Goldfarb a lot longer than I know him and whenever the Court is ready to hear from them, I can tell you who is present be who wants to come forward.

THE COURT: All right. Why don't we do that now.

Unless, Mr. Tarlowe, you want to respond to the certain points.

It doesn't have to be now.

MR. TARLOWE: It doesn't have to be now.

THE COURT: You will get an opportunity. I don't know if it makes sense for you to hear from everyone and then respond now or respond now to Mr. Soshnick and then respond after others have spoken.

MR. TARLOWE: I will be happy to do it once after they have spoken.

THE COURT: My practice generally, and I will tell everyone is not unique but I think it is somewhat usual, I typically do allow family members to address the Court. Most sentences that doesn't happen, but I think a sentence imposed

2.0

on one individual has affects on a great group of people and no one more significantly than family members who I think can very seriously be considered victims of the crime. I think it is important to give them an opportunity to be heard. I don't necessarily encourage them to do it because public speaking is difficult. Speaking in the courtroom is difficult. It can sometimes be a hard thing. I leave that up to the discretion of the individual friends and family members.

I read the letters. Sometimes people are more comfortable expressing themselves that way. No one should feel the need to stand up and speak out of fear I haven't read what is in the letters because I can assure you I have read those letters more than once. I thank you for taking the time to write them.

MR. SOSHNICK: In light of your comments, your Honor,
I would like to first call upon my client's mother Nancy
Goldfarb to address the Court.

THE COURT: Ms. Goldfarb, as I said before it is a difficult thing even for lawyers to speak in court. Take your time. Your name is Nancy Goldfarb, the usual spelling. You don't have to spell your name for the record. Some of the other speakers may have to do that. Speak clearly and take your time.

NANCY GOLDFARB: I don't want to disappoint my son. I don't want to be standing, like you said it very difficult but

2.0

I can disappoint him. You read my letter. I am his mother. I mean what mother is not going to stand here and tell you how great their child is and he is. I wish you knew him under different circumstances. I didn't plan this talk.

THE COURT: Speaking from the heart. I understand.

NANCY GOLDFARB: I don't cry. So if I do this is
going to be a first.

THE COURT: I do sometimes.

NANCY GOLDFARB: I don't. I am a rock. My son has been a great kid his entire life. I have gotten two phone calls in his life, November 5th from Robin that the FBI had arrested him. He is a very big practical joker. I thought it was a crazy joke. The other call I will tell you a little bit later.

Too much has been put on my son. I am always the one who handled everything. My husband and I were high school sweethearts, but when I was diagnosed he became useless. My son was a law school getting ready to do the bar, finals, whatever it was. He was the one that took me to surgeries, took me to treatment. Too much was put on him.

Forget this conspiracy. For me personally the biggest conspiracy was my husband went to my son behind my back and asked for help with health insurance.

THE COURT: That is in 2007?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

NANCY GOLDFARB: I am confused with the dates today.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

. 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I've always told my kids if anyone tells don't say something to your mother, red flag should go up. I didn't say that includes your father. He still to this day is covering my health insurance with all this stuff going on.

The second phone call. The first phone call ever, I said there were two phone calls, about Jason ever did wrong. He was in junior high. I get a call. I was in business with my husband. I get a call from the dean thinking it must be some kind of award, that is the only thing you ever hear with Jason, and he says to me, Ms. Goldfarb, I have a little boy sitting in any office with these blue eyes like oceans crying. He said, We had an incident in the lunch room. Incident in the lunch room? He says, Yeah, he was throwing spit balls. I So I pick him up from school and he gets in the said, What? car and the tears are flying. Ma, I have to ask you something. What do you back my lunch in? I said a bag. He said what do you put the sandwich in. Zip-lock bags. He said, Ma, it was tinfoil. It was tinfoil. Girls were flirting with me. started it. He was the lawyer then.

Other than that I never had anything with Jason other than awards, honors. This never should have been. I don't know what else I am supposed to say. I want to say the magic words. I am his mother. I am supposed to be there to fix everything and I can't fix this. It is left in your hands.

You know, he was a bad boy at two. He was a biter.

He used to bite kids. So we started his first day of the toddler program, drop him off. It is only going to be for two hours. I come back and Ms. Lynn says to me, Nancy, we had a little problem. Problem, what did he do? He bit this kid. She said, What have you tried? I said, I tried everything. I spoken to the pediatrician. I put salt on his tongue. Any idea anybody ever told me, I tried. She said, This is what we're going to do. Tomorrow I want you to bring a little brown paper bag and have a bunch of treats in there and we're going to do the reward system. Every day he goes through a day that he doesn't bite anyone, he will get to pick something out of the bag. 10 cent toys. He never bit again. Jason does well with not hash sentences and punishment but rewards. Try in your heart, please, to be lenient. I don't know what else to say.

Jason, I hope I did okay.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms: Goldfarb.

MR. SOSHNICK: Thank you, Ms. Goldfarb.

Your Honor, the next thing who would like to speak is my client's fiancee, Robin Kowlaski. Ms. Goldfarb referenced her.

THE COURT: Yes. I will ask you to spell your name first and last.

ROBIN KOWALSKI: I am Polish so I hope I can do. I have to make a joke. K-o-w-a-l-s-k-i, R-o-b-i-n. I am Jason's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

fiancée. I am an oncology chemotherapy nurse. I am here to stand before you obviously to beg for leniency for Jason, but for me too. Prior to Jason's arrest, which will be about two years ago almost, we were actively planning getting married and starting a family and obviously that has been put on hold. What I fear the most, what keeps me awake every night is not a lot of people know, only close family and friends, my early 20s I was diagnosed with a cardiac arhythmia and I went to several specialists and they had recommended that I have children. Don't wait until I am 30 to have start a family. It was advised strongly against waiting until after 35 and as of this past April I am now 30. So I fear if you are not lenient that it would be a live sentence for me if I am unable to have children because the real tragedy would be that Jason will be an excellent father, but I would be the best mother. So I just beg for leniency for him and for me. Thank you. I am sorry. THE COURT: That's all right. That's fine. Thank you.

MR. SOSHNICK: Your Honor, the defendant's father Marcel Goldfarb will like to address the Court.

MARCEL GOLDFARB: M-a-r-c-e-l. Good morning. I am

Marcel Goldfarb, Jason's father. What can I say? We have a

small family, but now I look around and I see a big family.

Jason is a good guy. So I see people here that must think the

same way as we do. I feel the burden I put on Jason is my

fault.

You know, you take a person who walks into a grocery store and you see there is a piece of bread and he only catches him, calls the police and arrests him. There is another guy who robs the truck full of groceries. That guy is greedy.

Jason or that person was hungry to help a person, and the store owner who caught that person should have a heart. He didn't steal because of greed. He stole because he was hungry. There is a difference between greed and necessity.

When my wife was diagnosed with cancer, I fell apart. Everything fell apart. So I feel I put a big burden on Jason. From the people I see here, he has heart. He must have touched these people's hearts like he always touched ours. If there was a way for me to take his place, I would do it right now.

THE COURT: I know you said that in your letter, but unfortuneately that is not possible as you know.

MARCEL GOLDFARB: Exactly. I wanted to let you know again in case you missed that, which I know you are very thorough.

I want my Jason back. I put him in another world and I feel most of it like I said is my fault and all these people here know the person my son is. We can't take it anymore. I want my son Jason that everybody knows. And incarceration I don't know what it would do to him. I know what it is doing to us as of now since all of this started. I want our Jason back.

2.0

He fell off a little bit and it is my fault. No one else's fault.

THE COURT: Why do you say it is your fault and no one else's fault?

MARCEL GOLDFARB: The burden. Because we always -- we taught our kids to protect your family and I think he just went off a little bit. He couldn't see us suffer. Jason doesn't want to see anybody suffer. He is the go-to guy, Jason. I think the world needs a person like Jason because he is a good guy. You can see from all the people here. He must have touched their hearts. So he went off the truck just like that guy who went in and stole the salami and bread. He wanted to survive. It wasn't out of greed.

So if the Court could show some leniency, it would be the best thing in the world you could do because we try to grow up our kids for the world and to be kind and gentle and be a good person. So if the Court, I would appreciate if the Court shows some leniency because incarceration with this gentleman, I am just scared that he is not going to come back as the Jason as we all know. Thank you very much for listening to me.

THE COURT: Thank you. This is difficulty. It is difficult and hard on families. That is one of the unfortunate realities with sentences. There are innocent people affected and certainly I am mindful of that. It is heartbreaking to think about.

MR. SOSHNICK: Thank you, your Honor. There are some clients of Jason who would like to address the Court. The first one is Kathy Capalvo.

KATHY CAPALVO: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let he ask you to spell your name. I read your letter, which was very moving.

KATHY CAPALVO: Kathy, K-a-t-h-y, Capalvo,
C-a-p-a-l-v-o. Jason is my lawyer. He has been my lawyer for
a couple of years, three years 11 months and six days. I lost
my husband lymphoma. This was caused by exposure. No one
wanted to help me. I have two sons and I had nothing. He was
our superman, our rock. We had nothing. I had no hope. I had
no way of getting restitution or supporting myself at the time
as a part-time teacher's aide and then Jason stepped up. He
became my lawyer.

He answered every question and I called him constantly -- constantly -- for everything. I didn't know what I was doing. I didn't know at that time that his mom was going through cancer also. So what I was putting on him, I can't imagine on top of what he was going through with his mom. He stuck with me and my son and he taught me. He answered every question. He was diligent, patient. He was kind to me. He saw how he cared for my sons and he said, You are like my mom. My mom will do anything for me. Now I see. Oh, my gosh.

He is a wonderful lawyer. He is my friend. Now I

just cannot say enough about Jason. I will say anything that will help him. I would be grateful to you. I would do anything for my sons. And what he did for his mom, he did for his mom. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MR. SOSHNICK: Your Honor, Linda Pryor is another client of Jason's who would like to address the Court.

LINDA PRYOR: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Just state your name and spell your name for the record.

LINDA PRYOR: Linda Pryor, L-i-n-d-a, P-r-y-o-r.

First, I have to say I was not -- I asked to be here today and I want to hold this together because after seeing his family speak and I know the pain they are going through, I almost feel like I don't have a right to be emotional. But I have been emotional about this ever since I heard about it. Jason is also my lawyer. Jason literally saved my life. When Jason came into my life, I was about to be evicted. I had no money. I had been injured on the job and I was not getting paid. I was in total despair and then I met Jason. He is such a good person. He fought for me. He answered every question I had. I don't care when I called Jason, he always had time for me. He offered any help that he could.

Sometimes people make mistakes and I know that it is so out of character, but when you are under stress, you are

likely to do anything especially when you have the history, the health history that his mother had. I know because my sister had cancer and I was willing to do anything to help her.

I am hoping that the Court will take into consideration how many people he has helped and know that nothing he did was not for profit for him. Jason is such a good person and he is my friend and there is no place else I would have been today except here to show support to someone who has done so much for me and I am really praying that the Court will take that into consideration. He really deserves a chance. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. I appreciate your taking the time.

MR. SOSHNICK: With the Court's permission Luis Crisafi, who was another client of Jason's.

LOUIS CRISAFI: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Spell your name.

LOUIS CRISAFI: Louis, C-r-i-s-a-f-i, L-o-u-i-s.

If I may, your Honor, I just if you don't mind will give you a quick background. First I would like to address the Court and say thank you for allowing me to address you. I would just like to say that my background is that I am a retired police officer, 25 years service and was injured on the job. Jason was my attorney. I don't know Jason really personally. My brother who is also an retired New York City

detective was good friends of his when they were younger, very good friends with the family. I came into contact with Jason a few years ago as a result of my injury. The only thing I can say about Jason is the guy is as solid as can be.

I have been a narcotics officer for over 25 years. Your Honor and I both know that every defendant gets in front of a court and they are sorry they got caught. That is what they are really sorry about. In this case, this is a man who is going to be sentenced for the rest of his life. What he did he is taking responsibility for. He did that by a plea bargain. He stepped up to the plate. What he is going to face now from this court and what he is going to face from his peers and all his friends and family and everything in his future, he will live with for the rest of his life.

I know from my background I know good people and I know when people need another chance. This is a say man, your Honor, that I beg the Court to give another chance to. I had the pleasure of learning who this man was in the last several years as a result of my injury. I wound up with some very severe psychological problems. He wasn't an attorney, he was a friend. He stepped up to the plate when other people turned their back. I cannot forget that. I just had epidural injections and I am not supposed be out of bed and I took the train in from Hoboken to get here. I would never do that and I would never take this Court's time if I didn't feel that it was

so important to let this Court know the kind of person that you have sitting in front of you.

I realize there are sentencing guidelines and there are situations that somebody needs to pay for the type of offense that they did. I implore this Court to take a very good, deep and hard look at the defendant in front of you and to be as lenient as possible. Personally I am incredibly impressed when I look around and an attorney has this many people that are in back of them. I want to thank your Honor for your time. I want to thank Jason for the friendship, the professionalism that he has provided me and I hope that justice is served today the best that your Honor sees fit.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. SOSHNICK: With the Court's permission, I would like to call upon one more client, Mava Hart.

THE COURT: Spell your name so the court reporter gets the correct spelling.

MAVA HART: M-a-v-a, H-a-r-t. First of all, I would like to -- I want to say so Jason's parents I want to thank you for the man that you created because Jason came into my life at a point where I felt the attorneys I had in my life weren't doing anything for me. I walked into Jason's office and he spoke to me. There was something in the way he said what he said that made me feel as though I had the best person in my life right in front of me. I had lost my baby sister to breast

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

cancer, the sister right behind me use three time survivor, and I was sitting in his life fearing for my own life because I thought I had breast cancer. Jason said to me, Don't worry about it. He said, I am going to take care of you. He said, I know someone that can help you and this is what you need, I am here for you. Whenever I called Jason about anything, Jason would always say, Don't worry about it, I will take care of it. I want to let you know, Jason took care of everything and he kept his word. He is a man of his word.

Your Honor, we all make mistakes. There is not a person in here that has made a bad decision, but we need Jason because he is passionate about the job that he does. He loves people. He loves the fact that he can help people and I've -everywhere I go when I find out someone needs a lawyer like Jason, I give his name and number and his cell number. He will tell you, Call me. I don't care what it is. I was lying in my bed and in a hospital. I had just had emergency surgery. said, Oh God, I have to call Jason and let him know what is going on. He said, Look, aside from the case if there is anything that you need, let me know. It doesn't have to be pertaining to the case. Just let me know and I will take care I know that he would do it and I appreciate the fact that he extended himself because in this day and time we don't have people who care.

I worked for New York City Transit Authority for 21

18.

years and I never seen anybody who had that kind of heart, that kind of passion because we're in a world that people care about themselves and themselves only. Jason cares about people.

People matter to Jason. We need Jason because he cares about people. We've got to the point where everything is everybody taking care of themselves and get what they want out of the situation. Yes, he will get paid for the work that he does, but he will never be paid for what he is really truly worth. Himself the way he puts himself on the line for people, he can never be paid for that.

The very fact that he is facing this situation, my heart is heavy because I know in his heart that he would never have made this decision if it had not been for the stress that he was put on. Family is family. You will make the sacrifices for your family. You will do whatever you need to do for your family. At that time this is a young man that is trying his best to hold his own, do what he need to do for himself as well as his parents. We live in a world today where kids don't even care about their parents. People don't care about one another, but he cares about his parents and put himself on the line and he knew he had to step up on the plate. I know what that is like when you have to be the person who has to stand up and be there for everybody else and put yourself on the back burner. So he made a decision based on the fact that I have to do what I have to do for my parents. There was no thought in his mind

`2

that, Wait a minute, I have think about my parents, my parents need me. Jason doesn't know this but I grew to love him because of the fact that he touched my heart.

Everyone I turned to and gave his number they called me back and they said, Mava, this is amazing, this man is awesome. Everyone told me Mava, I am so glad you told me about him. Jason will answer ever call. He doesn't care what time. He tells you, I am sorry for calling so late, but he will answer. We need people today because people are not -- they are not -- they don't care about one another and Jason cares.

If I could please, your Honor, please, I know that you have your sentencing guidelines, if nobody else needs him, I need him because there are times when I cannot make a decision for myself. I was at a point where I didn't even know how to write a letter and Jason said, Look, I will handle it for you and I thought about what he is going through and I felt like Mava, You cannot put that on Jason. Let him deal with the situation. He is dear to me and I kept thinking all this time there was something I could do for him.

When it came to the point of being here, I got up this morning with pain through my body and I prayed and I asked God, please give me the strength to be here because this man needs for people to know who he is and if there is something that I can say to you that would make it a little better that you would decide on his behalf to, you know, be lenient, please be

lenient because there are not people out there with that kind of passion. This man is passionate. I cannot tell you about that. Here, I am a black woman and you know he could call me, look, if I can do something for him, I would do it for him in a heartbeat.

I wanted him to know that you are special to me. You will always be special to me because he stood up for me when my family wasn't even there for me. That means a lot to me and I want to thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. SOSHNICK: Your Honor, as you can see there are many friends and family of my client who are here. Some of them would like to speak and I would like to beginning with Michael Barrows.

MICHAEL BARROWS: Good morning, your Honor. My name is Mike B-a-r-r-o-w-s. I am an attorney in New York. I went to law school with Jason. Throughout law school he helped me a lot. There have been some hard times and easy times. Jay has always had a love for the law and people. The second I met him we hit it off and became great friends. He is a wonderful person. There is a common thread between all these people who came up here. It shows that Jason is a very unique individual. He may have done something wrong.

THE COURT: No, he did something wrong.

MICHAEL BARROWS: He did something wrong. Judge, I

apologize. He took responsibility for it, Judge. It is, I just don't know what to say. I know Jay is a person very inclusive when it comes to his feeling. I wish he had told me about his problem with his family. I know Robin. I introduced him to his fiancée. I have been to his parents' house. I know his brother.

Regretably my mother could not be here today who knows Jay. She couldn't handle the fact that this was happening. My grandmother had pictures of Jason with my grandmother who was in South Carolina during the time that he was -- during the time of our graduation.

Soon after our graduation, I moved to Jay's block. I would get up and my job wasn't as demanding as his at first. would see Jay go in 7:00 in the morning. I would come home, maybe I would get food. I would see jay come home 9:00 or 10:00. He loved what he did. He loved being a lawyer and helping people. I think that everyone has attested to that already today, Judge. I think you received a lot of letters attesting to that fact.

What happened happened. I know he regrets it. He used to have dark hair like me two years ago and now it is gray. He is a good man, Judge. I pray that the Court will show leniency and mercy for him. It was done out of necessity and it was --

THE COURT: Why do you say that? Everyone keeps

. 13

saying it was done out of necessity. It was insider trading.

It is not a momentary lapse, right?

Are you familiar with the facts?

MICHAEL BARROWS: I followed it since day one, Judge.

I don't want to go -- I don't know -- I don't want to comment on that, Judge. There was a plea. I don't want to. I know he is regretful for what he did. He suffered emotionally, physically. He is losing his license. He suffered greatly in this and I would just ask, Judge, that the Court please show some leniency, mercy. He is a good man. He is a man who wants to start another life with his fiancée. This is a man who was punished enough I believe, Judge. I want to thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. SOSHNICK: John Merlino.

JOHN MERLILNO: Judge, I would like to start off --

THE COURT: Start off by stating your name and spelling it.

JOHN MERLILNO: M-e-r-l-i-n-o.

THE COURT: John.

JOHN MERLILNO: Yes. I would like to thank you, your Honor, for allowing us to speak today. You heard family speak on behalf of Jason as to his character and as a beautiful human being. I am like you, I cry, Judge. Jason has touched my heart. I have had the honor to meet him and work with him at

the old law firm in 2002. We all have a family member or a friend who is the life of the party, Jason was the life and sole of that firm. He would continually and constantly offer his help to fellow colleagues.

I had a moment in my life that I articulated in my letter where I too went through a hardship with my dad and I know many people, your Honor, but Jason came forward and I never forgot it. He offered so much help to watch our children so I could be with my dad, transport my mother to the hospital. No one offered that. I had a large family. No one came forward except Jason.

I noticed through the years as we worked together, and it is coming to fruition based on what I heard, the plea, everything that happened here, that in '07 Jason seemed to have his spirit smoothed. No one really understood why. Jason was close to many colleagues in the old firm. At times we would go out with other colleagues, he would drink a lot. It was out of character for Jason to do something like. He was the person who would initiate basketball games with other colleagues. He was very active in playing sports such as hockey. So when all this happened and I was active in Brooklyn working for some politicians at the time, there was rumors about a store in Sheepshead Bay called Sea Horse. That is my colleague's dad's store. It was rumored that he was having financial difficulty.

Moving forward as time went on Jason started e-mailing

the partners in the firm, other associates, if he could start working harder and participating in municipal pension department or social security department to earn more money. He came forward and he tried and he tried to seek help, but the problem with Jason he had pride and it is evident today based on the way everyone is speaking and the way his father articulated it as well. It is very hard to see a man like him sitting here today and going through the punishment that he is going through by losing his license. I know Jason. This is killing him that he has to sit here before his mother and his father and his fiancée. This is torture enough for this man. He has touched some people's lives. It is unfortunate. He has clients that are here at the old firm you can pack this room with probably 100 clients that Jason worked with and helped.

There was one particular client who was a priest, who was Father Mike, Father Champion. Jason was the one would was assigned to his case. What this man did, and I don't know if your Honor is familiar with worker's comp, workers' compensation take years to establish a thumb. This individual Father Champion was at Ground Zero, conducted last rites for the heros that had perished during that tragic event. It was unfortunate for the priest he developed lung diseases and whatnot. Jason was there. He helped him. He helped him obtain the medical treatment he needed. He helped Father Champion get his benefits. If I had access to our old firm's

clientele list, you would see literally hundreds of people here, your Honor, on behalf of Jason. This is who he is.

Your Honor articulated that it is a crime that affected other people and I think it is evident that a lot of people depend on him and need him. I have three older sisters and I know it is tragic for me, but I had the honor of being friends with Jason and he has truly been like a brother to me and the things that he has done especially when I was going through this hard time with my dad, I can never ever forget the unselfishness that he portrayed to me to help me and my family and I will never forget it.

I beg you of, your Honor, that you show mercy on him and truly believe in your heart that this is an individual that made a mistake and his lack of judgment wasn't his fault. He was under a tremendous amount of stress. It was evident working with him and seeing the change in Jason to life of the party to an individual who was to himself, very pensive. It makes sense now. So I beg of you, your Honor, please show him mercy to this man. He is a good man. He is a good person. By showing your leniency, you are really trying -- you are truly in my eyes and the eyes of everyone who is here for him that is justice.

THE COURT: You don't understand or you don't seem to there are other people who are not here who will be looking at this sentence. This sentence matters to others who don't know

Mr. Goldfarb personally, but it is an important sentence to them as well. You are a lawyer so you understand that.

JOHN MERLILNO: I understand as you indicated the guidelines.

THE COURT: Not just guidelines. There are other objectives of sentencing that are important. If lawyers get to commit crimes and able to say, Well, I am going to lose my license and that is punishment, what message does that send to a broader population?

JOHN MERLILNO: I can't speak for other individuals, your Honor. I can only speak for Mr. Goldfarb and knowing him as a friend and as an individual as a human being that is why I am here speaking --

THE COURT: I understand that.

JOHN MERLILNO: -- not conducting summations or arquing a case.

THE COURT: I am asking you to consider some of these other objectives. These are the objectives that Congress has directed be considered. As a lawyer, I think you more than some of the others who have spoken, might understand some of those, might consider them.

JOHN MERLILNO: I may or may not. I do worker's comp.

I appreciate your time.

THE COURT: I appreciate your being here. I understand you are speaking about what you know. You are

2.1

speaking about a person that you regard as a friend and even more than a friend, as a brother you said. That is true of the others who have spoken and the others who have not spoken but written letters.

JOHN MERLILNO: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. SOSHNICK: Just two more friends and colleagues and then I will call on Dr. Kirwin to speak. With the Court's permission the next speaker will be Jared Levine.

JARED LEVINE: J-a-r-e-d, L-e-v-i-n-e.

Your Honor, I am here speaking on behalf of my partners at Durish, Levine and Morgan. I am the managing partner of the firm. We represent about 200 other clients of Jason's who could not be here today but we are the voice for them as well.

I met Jason about two years ago after he got arrested. I didn't find out about it until maybe two or three months after that. I just happened to go online. I forgot his mailing address. All of a sudden Jason Goldfarb, insider trader, million dollar claims and I didn't believe it. It took me weeks to keep going back to look for pictures to see if it was really Jason and I saw that his law firm he worked for at the time was listed, too. I couldn't believe that it was the person who I knew.

As managing partner attorney I have to have good judgment. People who I bring into my family of business, they

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

have to be honest and trustworthy, compassionate and that is who Jason was to me. I was shocked. I couldn't believe that he was that person. Then he addressed it with me and discussed with me what was going on in his life at that time when he was doing the insider trading. He told me about Nancy, he told me about her being diagnosed with cancer. I heard it. I kind of internalized it. It could have been an excuse. I didn't make that much sense to me because that is what I have to do as an attorney, I have to judge people what they did, some are right, some are wrong, some I don't believe, some I do. Then I just went on thinking Jason was a criminal, that I had bad judgment on who I brought into my family.

Then on Easter weekend of this year we got one of those phone calls that my 38-year-old sister was diagnosed with Stage 4 lymphoma and it was everywhere. I am not a sentimental person. As my job, I can't be. I need to be very straight and unemotional, but that shook us to our core. After a couple weeks of going into work as a zombie and just having to pull off to the side of the road because I couldn't drive because I was losing it, I started thinking about Jason and about what he was going through around the time when I was dismissing what he was telling me about his family.

I have a very good moral compass I think. I think I have very good judgment. I started thinking what if? My sister has perfect health insurance. She is doing well.

Everything is good. What if she didn't? What if I had to pay for that and I couldn't would I as an attorney with good judgment as a manager partner do what he did, and before that happened to my sister there is no way. It never even would have crossed my mind. I am not a criminal. But when you look at the total of the circumstances, you know as I am sitting on the side of the road on the Turnpike for those two weeks, I am not the same person who I was. I am not that person now.

Everything is a little bit better and my judgment may have been clouded. I may have done the things that I wouldn't normally do so that my sister could get chemo or she could have you dignity of having a wig that cost \$5,000 that insurance doesn't pay for.

So everyone thinks -- they talk about a mental disease that impairs his judgment and I didn't buy that before and I completely do because when you look at the affect that it is going to have on you personally, what he would have been an insider trader if this happened to his mother? No shot. I don't think so. I don't think. He has good judgment. The person I know now is not the same person who was trading at the time I fully believe. I didn't know him when he was trading at the time, but I know him now.

Let me speak about punishment. Losing his license, embarrassment to family and friends. That is punishment enough. Obviously he is never going to this. We talk about

suicide. What is the message that you are going to send to society if you are lenient? Society is here today. You have all the clients, you have the attorneys, firms. This is society. I think if there is leniency and not sending him to prison, the message is that there is compassion for people who have a mental disease, who are not themselves when they do something. Something he may have committed.

THE COURT: No one has said he has a mental disease. We'll hear from the psychologist. I get a lot of reports and overstate it.

Have you read the report?

JARED LEVINE: I haven't read the report, but I spoke to his doctor.

THE COURT: We shouldn't overstate what the facts on the record are at this point.

JARED LEVINE: Absolutely. My only point is that the person who is sitting here now I don't think is the same person who was committing these crimes and I would ask for leniency on his behalf.

THE COURT: I appreciate your time in writing the letter. I hope everything is all right with your sister.

JARED LEVINE: Thank you.

MR. SOSHNICK: Your Honor, with your permission Joseph A. Romano, Esq., would like to address the Court.

THE COURT: Yes.

7.

JOSEPH A. ROMANO: Good morning, your Honor. Thank you for permitting me to speak.

THE COURT: For the court reporter just so she gets the correct spelling.

JOSEPH A. ROMANO: Romano, Joseph A., R-o-m-a-n-o.

I have known Jason for many years now. I am his employer. I employed him after his arrest. Not that I am in the best position to know everything about him, I felt compelled to believe in him and let me tell you why, Judge. I have been an attorney for 25 years. That really started when I was about five years old. I was with my father who is still alive who is going to be 84 next week who was an attorney admitted since 1952. My father taught me a lot of things. He taught me about the good and about the bad. I have seen some bad people, very bad people, Judge. They wrote books about them. But I also have had the unique opportunity in seeing things and seeing people that interact on a daily basis --politics, life struggles. You start to pick up on things. You pick up on things that are very important to other people.

I was in comp court in Yonkers. That is basically my bailiwick. I am a Yonkers guy. My father is from Yonkers. My brothers are all attorneys and the Romano family is well known in Yonkers. I was there and I was doing my cases and I saw this almost like a whirlwind come in one day. I said, Who is this kid? Who does he think he is walking into my place acting

like this? He talked to his clients and what I saw was every one of their faces lit up with hope and hope is a very important thing in this life that we live. I believe that you are very sensitive to that that as long as we instill hope in people that the life that can be very difficult and the trial and tribulations that we do go through makes it a lot easier.

And over the years I got to see him and I always said to him, Listen, when you get tired of making money with those big shots in New York why don't you come work with me and really learn how to work. An opportunity arose, Judge. With every bad thing, something good can come out of it. That is what I believe in. So when he was arrested and I reached out to him and I said, Listen, Jason, I know you have issues, problems. You come with me, work with me, you come on to my roof. What we believe, and I told him, I don't care about the money. I just care about the people. That is what I was raised to believe in and that is what all the Romanos believe in because that is what my father instilled in us as well as my mother. We sacrificed for the good of the people.

He never missed a day of work. He worked 100-hour weeks. He would challenge me and he would call me at 10:00 at night. Something like my father would do and still does to me, Are you still working? Are you still working? And we've had a lot of fun together the last 20 months working and trying to get through this problem of his.

So, Judge, I've tried some cases. I've been in front of your colleagues, but previous to your time there was a Judge Schartzberg up in White Plains. That is where I was in federal court. He was a bankruptcy judge. There was another judge, Charlie Bryant. And those judges from my experience they understood the rules. They knew what they had to do and they also weighed the facts and circumstances of each case. I hear what you are saying, Judge. I listen to the things that you say. I understand your concern as a lawyer and what you are going have to portray out there, what is the general public going to say if you are lenient for this person. He did a bad thing. There is no question about it. I don't understand what he did.

What were you thinking? You were going into a world where these guys, they will eat you alive. They have the hot sauce waiting for you. You had no business being there. It was the wrong place. These guys eat you. They will eat everybody. That is what they do. They just don't understand. Money is their God. They don't understand about family and this. It is about money. You are in the wrong place, wrong time. I don't understand why you would go in that room. You went in that room.

I understand it hurt everybody. I am very angry because I wanted this kid to be with me so we could fight the fight because there are not too many fighters in this world. I

.1

watch. I know who is fighting. Most people just give up.

They quit. He doesn't quit. We need these kinds of people
that fight, have that leadership ability. Now he is going have
to turn a page because obviously he is going to lose his
license. The qualities that I see in him as a leader, as a
fighter, as someone that instills hope in people, I am not
going to let that go, Judge.

I understand you have to do your job and I understand what you are going to do, but I am not going to give up on this kid. I want you to think about your sentence, and I know you have already have, your Honor, but I believe in this kid. I have not stood up for anybody in 51 years, and I have represented a lot of criminals back in the day. I did a lot of criminal cases so I have an idea about what it is to represent criminal defendants. But this kid is special. One of the clients says he is special. He is a special kid.

He shouldn't have been in that dark place. He should not have been there. I am still angry at him. I am furious at him that he even ventured into these people's world. He had no right being there. I wish he came to me and said I need the \$32,500 because I would have written him a check and said, That is your bonus. You come work for me. But he don't do that. I don't know why. I cannot explain that. I understand there has to be a message conveyed out there because people have to have it. I was here for the Cutillo sentence, Judge.

THE COURT: You were?

JOSEPH A. ROMANO: I shed a tear that day because I saw the pain of his wife who couldn't even speak. I was there. But this particular person, Jason Goldfarb, he is a little bit different. He shouldn't have been in that room. These other guys, that was their world. They understood.

THE COURT: Cutillo was recruited by Mr. Goldfarb.

Mr. Goldfarb was his college roommate and targeted him because he was a source of information. I don't know if the folks who spoke know about this case. That is what happened and I reviewed what was done. I saw what happened. Cutillo is the not the guy with the hot sauce. Cutillo is the guy who Mr. Goldfarb targeted because he was a person with access to information that could be used for profit.

JOSEPH A. ROMANO: Judge, I disagree with you in one sense, Judge, Cutillo was in that world. Jason wasn't in that world. He was familiar with people in mergers and acquisitions. He knew these people with Wall Street. He didn't know about all the big deals.

THE COURT: Cutillo was a patent attorney at a law firm in New York.

JOSEPH A. ROMANO: Yes, Judge, at Ropes & Gray. I disagree with you.

THE COURT: I think I know a little bit more of the facts than you do.

2.

JOSEPH A. ROMANO: What I want to end with today,
Judge, and what I want to indicate, Judge, those other judges I
had mentioned earlier, they understood the rules and they also
understood all the facts and all the things that could go into
a sentence of this individual. And one in particular letter
was from Father Vincent and he indicated he would hope that you
would show compassion. And with all the things that are in
front of you, which is not an easy case, it is a very complex
case because you have a psychological report, you have the
guidelines, family and friends, there is a way to fashion
something that would show a strong enough message to the
general public and what you want to accomplish and still show
some compassion to this particular individual based on the
circumstances, your Honor. I hope you do that.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. SOSHNICK: Your Honor, my client would like to address the Court.

THE COURT: He has a right to and obviously will. You said you --

MR. SOSHNICK: Dr. Kirwin to address the Court. That is what we're going to do now.

DR. KIRWIN: Dr. Barbara Kirwin, K-i-r-w-i-n.

Your Honor, I stand behind you with a lot of hats today. You obviously have read my report and I know because I have been before you in the past that you do really take the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24.

25

time to read the psychological reports and I very much appreciate that. So I am here in my forensic capacity because I truly believed as was indicated in the Probation report that there is an issue of a mental disease or defect that formed a diminished capacity, a damage to Jason's reasoning, to his thinking, to his ability to make decisions, to his ability to control his emotions and impulses.

I think you raised a very important point when you mentioned to all of the people who spoke that Jason was acting out of necessity. Well, one might say that everybody who commits an offense perceives that there is some necessity to that offense. To me as a forensic psychologist that is not the entire argument because I truly believe that if there was only the necessity of his family as dear and as stressed and as needy as they were, Jason would not be sitting here today. far as I am concerned, what tipped it over, what allowed Jason to do something in desperation that was anathema to everything that he was brought up to believe in and everything that he professes was the fact that he is beginning to suffer from what ultimately ends up into a bipolar disorder, which we know is a biological genetically based disorder. It has been classified now as a biological disorder that cripples lives that in fact crippled his grandmother's life. So I am not going to go down that path of being the forensic psychologist today. the report.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I stand in front of you today as a clinical person who has treated Jason very extensively sense I met him and as a former parole officer who has worked for keeping people rehabilitated in the community. What I want to say is that extraordinary in this case, aside from the fact that in my 30 years I have never saw a courtroom packed like this, is the cooperation and the teamwork and the networking that went on between myself and Jennifer Powers, his pretrial probation officer, and Katrina Minus-Shepherd the probation officer who did the presentencing report. I believe it was a model of community, dual supervision. And as a clinician I see that it is the absolute best treat modality to prevent him going down the path of developing this more severe genetic illness. the parole officer in me says this is the piece that is going to stop recidivism. We controlled the mental illness aspect, we're not going to have this kind of behavior anymore.

THE COURT: You think there is a prospect of recidivism?

DR. KIRWIN: I don't think so. Not in terms of his character. In terms of what caused this offense, Jason keeps everything very, very closely inside him. In fact, the reason he came into therapy was because his pretrial probation officer Jennifer Powers noticed there was agitation, depression, irrationality. In fact, I am sure you've heard the prosecution's wiretap tapes and she also was privy to them,

they are like a textbook for hypomania, which ends of as bipolar disorder. There is grandiosity, there is excessive use of expletives. There is --

THE COURT: If that is true then virtually everybody in this case is suffering from the same disorder.

DR. KIRWIN: I was at the Cutillo sentencing.

THE COURT: Did you listen to the tapes?

DR. KIRWIN: Yes.

I was at the Cutillo sentencing I read a lot of material in that case and it is just -- it doesn't reach the level of a diagnostic entity.

THE COURT: I am talking about most of tapes that relate to the subject matter that you've been talking to or conversations between Mr. Goldfarb and Mr. Goffer.

DR. KIRWIN: Yes.

THE COURT: Would you suggest Mr. Goffer is suffering from the same disorder?

DR. KIRWIN: No. Because Mr. Goffer is talking about making money and all this. And in fact he did, Mr. Goldfarb, is talking about, Wow, I will be rich and I will be set for life. A point in fact \$32,000 that you write every penny of that to your parents does not make you rich for life and set for life.

THE COURT: The plan was not to make \$32,000. If you listen to the tapes, you would know that the plan was to do

this repeatedly. The plan was to do this on a bigger scale.

The plan was to put bigger placements on the trade that

couldn't be placed that would yield much larger returns.

DR. KIRWIN: That is what is on the tapes and my understanding and my questioning in the therapy sessions with Jason is I do not believe, or at least he is not indicating to me, that was his intention, that his intention was to stop at that point, to pay off what his parents needed to get out of their difficulty.

THE COURT: Your report doesn't get into the specifics either.

DR. KIRWIN: No.

THE COURT: When costs were incurred, when payments were made, when diagnoses were made. Of course, some of the most damning tapes are from 2008.

DR. KIRWIN: Yes.

THE COURT: Well after the 32,000 was paid when there are plans to do more and no one speaks to that. Your suggestion is, what, at that point already received \$32,000 he now is just talking because it was his mental illness speaking, there was no real plan?

DR. KIRWIN: That is what I believed because I didn't -- I don't see him utilizing that information in any way.

THE COURT: There was information that was transferred

1

in 2008.

2

3

4

5.

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. KIRWIN: Trading.

THE COURT: It wasn't Mr. Goldfarb who did the The trades were done. trading.

DR. KIRWIN: No, but he could have certainly If his intention was to continue to make these really big bucks on this, he certainly would have been able to trade on it.

THE COURT: The claim was never for Mr. Goldfarb to trade on it. The claim was for Goffer and others who could trade under the radar to make money and then pay money to the sources and Mr. Goldfarb. Mr. Goldfarb got a full third, an equal share with the sources. The plan in February and March of 2008 was to continue doing this on a bigger scale. was information that was conveyed in fact at that time period. It didn't ultimately pan out the way the earlier trades had.

It is difficult to see based on the record how one could conclude that he didn't intend to go forward with the plan in February or March of 2008.

DR. KIRWIN: Well, if he had even continued to go forward with the plan, what I see for him at that point in time was really extremely manic behavior and we were seeing some examples of that earlier on. In the Probation report there is an indication or suggestion of the possibility of remanding him for his own safety at this point in time because both

1

2

3

4

.5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

.13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Minus-Shepherd and Powers were both seeing this kind of escalation of this manic, really out-of-touch behavior. It is almost when a car red lines.

THE COURT: In March of 2008.

THE DEFENDANT: No, at this time currently.

THE COURT: I am focused on during the scheme. What you said is that you don't believe that the tapes which reflect him talking about a lot more money are reflective of an actual intent to do that and I think that is extremely implausible and very hard to square with the evidence in the case.

I see it as more of his manic DR. KIRWIN: grandiosity, and I am not sure that if he had been stopped at that point if in fact that would have continued. Because I think if you listen to him on the tape, it is in no way what anybody hears about him in real life. You have seen people who know him as a colleague, his family members, clients and there is a consistent thread that runs through what this man's personality and character. What I have to look at as a clinician is okay what the character and then what is the mental disease or defect, like an overcoat that goes on top of that that warps or distorts the character that makes an individual do something that is so against their moral compass when they are in their right mind. And that is what I think we see with Mr. Goldfarb is the perfect storm and what I look towards is how do we in terms of punishing, in terms deterring

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

all of those things very important and I am 100 percent behind that but how do we bring him back into the community a whole person, how do we keep him in the community, how do we make sure that not only is something like this never going to happen again, and I believe it never will just based on his character, but how do we when we have this opportunity to intervene to do what we know in the psychiatric profession is a way to stop this biological genetic disease from progressing such that he will never be able to help and assist in any way in any way to any of his clients. I know he will never be able to assist as an attorney that that is a concern I have. And the model that I see is what was accomplished with Probation, which is really, really comprehensive and extensive and lengthy probation, with house arrest, with alcohol treatment, with gambling treatment, with mental health treatment and medication monitoring and very, very extensive community service.

THE COURT: Thank you, Doctor. I appreciate it.

Mr. Tarlowe I think is going to get a chance to speak and then I will hear from Mr. Goldfarb.

Mr. Tarlowe.

The court reporter has asked for a break. We started at 10:00 and it is now noon. So why don't we take a 10-minute break.

(Recess)

THE COURT: We'll hear from Mr. Tarlowe at this point.

2425

25.

MR. TARLOWE: Thank you, your Honor. For the reasons that we set forth in our sentencing submission, we do believe that a guideline sentence is appropriate and is warranted here. I don't intend to speak at any great length, but I would like to touch upon some of the factors the Court must consider that I don't think have really been addressed.

think also everybody has responsibility to address the different factors and objectives of sentencing and to respond to some of the points made because there are a group of people here who obviously will leave this courtroom and want to understand what happened. So I think it is important to respond as much as you can to the points they've made. Sometimes very, very powerfully and emotionally but thoughtful.

THE COURT: Look, I understand the factors but I do

MR. TARLOWE: Certainly, Judge, I will try to do that. In doing that, I will touch upon the nature and seriousness of the offense, the actual role that this defendant played in that offense as well as the need for just punishment and general deterrence.

One thing I wanted to talk about was the defendant's motivation for engaging in the conduct. I think that is something that we heard a tremendous amount about from the letters that were submitted on behalf of the defendant as well as from people who spoke today on his behalf. We have heard a lot about how this was conduct that he engaged in out of

necessity and how he had no choice. Was it his fault? To be clear, I don't dispute and I have no basis to dispute what we have heard about the circumstances that his mother and father faced. But the picture that has been painted of Mr. Goldfarb as somebody who engaged in this conduct not for any personal gain, not because of greed but only out of necessity and desperate circumstances, I think that is a picture is that very hard to reconcile with the picture that emerges from the evidence, most specifically the wiretaps, the phone calls.

The calls made clear that Mr. Goldfarb expressed no discomfort, no hesitation about engaging in this conduct. He didn't appear to have any reservations about it, but quite to the contrary was very active, enthusiastic, participant in that conduct. He is not somebody who appeared on those tapes to be doing this out of desperation. On the calls he repeatedly talks about how much money they can make. He clearly was very excited and eager when he learned from Mr. Goffer that Zvi Goffer had gotten a job at Galleon, this hedge fund where they could double, triple, quadruple the size of the trade, could increase the amount of money they were making and could conceal or camouflage what they were doing because Galleon was so big.

Mr. Goldfarb said things on those calls like, We're talking millions. Everyone one of us should be set for life within a year or two if things are played right. We're going to make a fortune this year. Then he talks about how he spent

4.

the money the \$32,500 that he got and he says to Zvi Goffer, I am at the point where I need to refill, Dude. I need another one. I got to refill. Again, it doesn't sound like somebody who is doing this out of desperation.

He also had many opportunities to stop the conduct along the way. This was not a momentary lapse in judgment. Several people have referred to it as a mistake. This wasn't a mistake. This was a conscious decision that he made repeatedly over a period that spanned nearly a year from the summer of 2007 to at least May of 2008. I think respectfully I would suggest to the Court that Dr. Kirwin's suggestion that that talk was -- certainly there was some exaggeration on those calls. I don't dispute that. But the suggestion that that talk did not reflect the actual plan that they had is just belied by the evidence.

THE COURT: You attached several transcripts and you brought the recordings?

MR. TARLOWE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I may ask you to play one of those later.

MR. TARLOWE: Certainly. But as late as March 2008
Mr. Goldfarb is providing information about Clear Channel. The
Court is familiar with that evidence. As the Court I am sure
recalls in March 2008 that is when the Ropes & Gray lawyers
actually got the information wrong. Zvi Goffer was in a panic
about public reports that the deal was collapsing. He turns to

Mr. Goldfarb, Goldfarb goes and meets with the lawyers and there is a series of events through the night and into the next day. And then in May 2008, in mid-May 2008, he began relaying additional information about Clear Channel and at that point the Clear Channel deal did close. So this is conduct he did engage in through at least May 2008 that related to a number of stocks and it was repeated time and time again.

I think another fact that is difficult to reconcile with this picture that has been painted as somebody acting out of desperation is that in February 2008 it is our understanding that Mr. Goldfarb actually got a new car in February 2008. He got a new BMW 528. Obviously nothing wrong with that, but I just think it is difficult to reconcile that with somebody who is supposedly doing this to help his parents and we have heard this was somebody who didn't have a lavish lifestyle, that every penny went to his parents. To be clear, I cannot trace those dollars. It may be that the \$32,000 went to his parents. I don't know but it does appear that he attained a new vehicle that I suspect costs upwards of 35 or \$40,000 in February 2008 while was still engaged in this conduct. So if he was doing it out of necessity, certainly he could have sought a more economical car and used that money for better use.

I also want to talk a little bit more about the defendant's role in the offense and some of the specifics about the conduct here. I think a lot of the speakers here today who

obviously spoke from the heart and had very nice things to say about Mr. Goldfarb, I think they have the window into one aspect of his life and it certainly is an aspect of his life that the Court should and will I am sure will consider when the thinking about the history and characteristics of the defendant, but that is only one aspect of the defendant's life. And I think that a lot of the people who spoke do not have a window into another aspect of his life that your Honor has been privy to and that is the offense conduct. I just suspect that a lot of these people are not familiar with the facts of what the crime entailed and what Mr. Goldfarb himself did.

Mr. Goldfarb, as the Court pointed out, recruited the Ropes & Gray lawyers into this scheme. He helped corrupt those attorneys. He was paid the same as the Ropes & Gray lawyers for providing information to Zvi Goffer. He also had a greater understanding of the scope and magnitude of the scheme than the Ropes & Gray lawyers did. He didn't know all of it, but he certainly knew Zvi Goffer and Emanuel Goffer were using the information and he had a better understanding of the magnitude of the trading because he was in direct contact with Zvi Goffer and Zvi Goffer talked to him about that. He also provided both sets of prepaid phones to Ropes & Gray lawyers, which he got from Zvi Goffer, and he gave instructions to the Ropes & Gray lawyers, Mr. Santarlas and Mr. Cutillo.

He said things so Zvi Goffer on the phone, like, when

they are talking about information that had come from the Ropes & Gray lawyer, Mr. Goldfarb said, That is me drilling it into them. The last one never would have happened if I don't press them and drill them every single time. There was another call where Zvi Goffer was telling Goldfarb what to say to the Ropes & Gray lawyers and Mr. Goldfarb said let me write this down. You have to bullet point everything for these guys. So he was a very significant and active participant in the criminal conduct and his roles with a significant one. We don't think his role was merely one of a go-between as has been characterized by Mr. Soshnick.

I think it is also worth noting that it is clear that Mr. Goldfarb has been very dedicated to his clients and has produced what appeared to be extraordinary results for some of them. We don't take issue with that and we think that is something that the Court should and can take into account. But as a lawyer, the defendant also had other obligations, other ethical obligations besides the duties that run to his clients. Every lawyer has a duty to abide by the law like everybody else and lawyers actually have a duty and ethical obligation to report misconduct of other lawyers. Far from doing that Mr. Goldfarb actually actively encouraged and facilitated the commission of crimes by other attorneys as well.

Certainly a lot of the people who spoke it is very moving to listen to them. It certainly was. It is obvious and

very clear that another category of victims in this case is Mr. Goldfarb's family and his friends. They clearly have been hurt by this and will continue to be hurt by it. Unfortunately I think a reality of the criminal justice system is that when people commit crimes and get punished for committing those crimes that punishment impacts not only the defendant him or herself but the friends and family of the defendant and that is a real and unfortunate consequence of engaging in criminal activity.

I think there are also other categories of victims who we don't get to hear from, the investors who are hurt by this type of conduct. We don't have somebody to come in and represent those investors. This type of conduct undermines the integrity of the market. It undermines investors' right to a fair playing field, a fair market. We don't get to hear from those people. There are a number of different categories of victims some of which the Court has heard from but some of which the Court does not get to hear from. I think it is also important that the Court takes into account the impact that this conduct has on those victims as well.

I want it talk very briefly about the efforts tod cooperate to make sure the Court has a clear picture of what happened. From an early point Mr. Goldfarb did through his attorney express a desire to cooperate. There was a proffer very early on that related to other unrelated activities. The

proffer did not cover the conduct at issue here because the government's view was that it wasn't interested in Mr. Goldfarb's cooperation. As the trial approached, Mr. Goldfarb obtained new counsel, Mr. Soshnick. Mr. Soshnick again reiterated his interest in cooperating that we didn't have an interest in Mr. Goldfarb's cooperation.

After repeated discussions and persistence frankly of Mr. Soshnick, we agreed that we would meet with Mr. Goldfarb for a proffer with the understanding that we viewed it as extremely unlikely that we would agree to use his cooperation to give him the 5K letter. We met for two proffers on that understanding. Mr. Goldfarb did sit with us for a number of hours and answer a lot of questions. We made the decision that we did not feel that we needed his assistance and we didn't use it.

Two things that did come out of the proffers: One, Mr. Soshnick mentioned there was a piece of paper with Zvi Goffer's handwriting that Mr. Goldfarb gave us. We did not introduce that as an exhibit at trial. However, Mr. Goldfarb did provide information about a safe deposit box that he had opened I think within a day or two of the acquisition being announced. We were then able to obtain the records of that safe deposit box and we did introduce those records at trial.

I think the only other thing I wanted to say, Judge, is in terms of general deterrence, something that the Court has

alluded to, is something that is very important here. This is a crime that presents a potential for very significant financial rewards. It is also a crime that is difficult to detect and difficult to prosecute. I think especially in light of those realities, it is important that there be substantial punishment for people who are caught engaging in this so that as other people think through that calculus in their mind of the potential benefits and one hand, the difficulty of the government detecting and prosecuting people, I think it is important that people faced with these types of choices understand there are very substantial penalties for this type of conduct.

Unless the Court has any questions, I don't have anything else.

THE COURT: With respect to forfeiture, it is not restitution, it is just forfeiture?

MR. TARLOWE: Just forfeiture, your Honor. We have a proposed order of forfeiture. The amount is the amount of the stipulated gain in the plea agreement, which is \$1,103,131.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Goldfarb, you have a right to address the Court.

You don't have to. As you know, you have a right to and you are welcome to. I guess you are at the point in the proceeding now that that is all that is left before I impose sentence.

THE DEFENDANT: Do you want me to sit here or stand

(212) 805-0300

here?

THE COURT: Whatever you are comfortable doing. Speak slowly so the court reporter can get it all down. You can move the box of tissues.

THE DEFENDANT: I have a written statement prepared, but some of the questions that you asked some of the people and some of the things that you seem troubled by as well, I am also troubled by. It seems that you are also focusing on the time line. I don't think anyone had specifically correct.

I was approached by Zvi Goffer around 2006 and all he told me at the time was, Jason, listen, you are an attorney if you know anyone that does corporate type stuff like that, let me know. He didn't allude to why or anything like that at the time. It wasn't until actually probably around 2005. Then in 2006 I had been ran into Cutillo. We were, I think, at a card game and he had said to me his firm merged with another firm and he is doing some type of corporate law. I said, You have to meet my friend Zvi he had mentioned something. It was after that. Still at the time I didn't know what Zvi was talking about.

Then we went to a dinner and that is when Zvi had laid out this idea. This is back in 2006. And both Cutillo and I talked about it. I wasn't really going to be a player in this thing. Cutillo, listened and said, Oh, not really interested. It wasn't until the time when all this other stuff was going on

with my parents and my parents' woes and my mother's condition that right around that time is when all of a sudden I got this phone call from Cutillo. I followed what happened at the trial and I followed and I would be able to read about in the papers. I still think it is somewhat wrong. I believe I would never come here and lie today. It could only hurt me.

My understanding the way it was explained to me is that Mr. Santarlas actually approached Mr. Cutillo saying that, listen I have access to this information and I am going to trade this information on my own. And that is when Cutillo who had his own personal circumstances going on had said to him, Wait, I think there is a better way and that is when it all started happening around that time. So the time line that is given I think is a little bit skewed. I am not making any excuses. I just wanted it to be clear exactly what was going on.

Shortly to rebut the thing about the car. My company at the time, that is the car they gave me. It was through them. It really didn't cost me that and the parking was paid on by my firm at the time.

Your Honor, I stand before you a broken man. I make no excuses for my conduct and I take full responsibility for my actions. I can promise you two things: The first thing that you have never had a defendant stand before you more repentant and sorry. I have and continue to apologize not only to all my

family, friends and clients but to your Honor, the government, and all those harmed in any way by my actions.

Next I can assure you that there as an absolute impossibility that you or ever judge will see me again as a defendant in a criminal action. I know the saying is there are no certainties in life, but I swear to your Honor this in fact a certainty. It is not easy for me to stand here and speak in front of all these people. I am humbled, appreciative but feel very undeserving of all their love and support. Family has no choice but to love and support you, but the amazing outpouring I received from all my clients is quite possibly the only thing that has gotten me through this time. On many dark days they were reminding me of some of the good I managed to do throughout my life and for this I thank them.

As my family, friends and clients who are here today confessed, I have always held myself to a very high standard in all aspects of my life for a very long time. I know I let myself and so many others down and nobody can or will punish me more than I have and will continue to punish myself. Over the pat 20 months, I began to take steps and look into how I got myself into this situation and ensure that it never happens again. I dedicated myself to treatment with Dr. Kirwin, who surprisingly I have been able to open up to and I found my time with her extremely help. You have but only one life to live and I have forever tainted mine. I set out to help those I

love but ended up making things so much worse. I will never forgive myself for the pain and hurt I have caused so many people close to me.

However, the biggest punishment of all to me is that I am being stripped of my ability to represent my clients who I consider family and hold so dear. As my mother can tell you, since I was about eight years old I had always wanted to be an attorney. Against all odds, I became one. I devoted the time I spent as an attorney making sure my clients always got what they deserved and were never taken advantage of. To me there is no worse punishment than being told I can no longer do that.

From the start of my situation, I have tried to do absolutely everything in any power to make amends for my actions. This includes proffer sessions with the government, turning over any and all evidence I had access to to them immediately and I have and I will continue to cooperate with the SEC in their ongoing investigation. After my sentence here today, your Honor, I assure you that I will not stop trying to help. Everyone speaks of general deterrence and I agree that is definitely an important goal. My goal would be to deter others in society from making the same mistakes I have. If the Court will permit me I would like to speak at law schools and perhaps colleges to discuss the mistakes I have made and try to ensure that other people and lawyers not travel down the same path as I did and make the mistakes I have. I feel there are

many ways to send a message to society and perhaps this will be the strongest way for me to do that.

Judge, if you are willing to take a chance on me, I will promise you will never regret it. I will tackle this challenge and responsibility of everything I have and I swear to your Honor you will not be disappointed and I hope that one day I can become an example of someone who was able to gain respect of society and those around him including your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Goldfarb.

Mr. Goldfarb, ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you what we'll do now. At this point I will state the sentence I intend to impose and I will offer my reasons for it. I will then after that ask the lawyers if there is any legal impediment or any reason under the law that I can't impose the sentence that I have in mind. If there is none then I will formally impose sentence.

In our system judges explain their reasons for sentencing. There is no need for any defendant, there is no need for any person in a courtroom to guess what a judge is thinking at the time of sentencing. Judges are obliged to provide their reasons, to provide an explaination as what they considered, what they weighed and what mattered to them in reaching a determination that is of obvious importance to the defendant but also has serious, serious repercussions for other

. 8

people, family members, friends and others.

So it is important for the Court to do this. It is important for the Court to weigh the different objectives of sentencing because at the end of this proceeding each of you will leave and you will have a sense as to what happened here today and whether this system works or whether it is worthy of the name court of law and court of justice. It is impossible that everyone will leave this courtroom in agreement with the sentence that is imposed. Just listening to the two lawyers I think it makes it clear a range of opinions as to what would be appropriate and there is nothing I can say that will make everyone in this room happy.

The goal I think or any goal of sentencing is to make sure that people even if they disagree with the sentence will understand and perhaps appreciate that this process was careful, that it wasn't callus, that it wasn't mean spirited, reflexive, that it was thoughtful and that it was careful. That is what I think the most one can ask for a human institution and that is what I will endeavor to do now.

There are different objectives of sentencing, some of which mentioned by the lawyers and others today are first of foremost what we spent a lot of time talking about, facts and circumstances of Mr. Goldfarb's life, the defendant's personal history. That is important because no two individuals are alike. They are all unique. And each has to be considered as

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

an individual and the sentence imposed has to tailored to that individual.

Another objective of sentencing, though, one the Court has to consider, Congress has directed courts to consider it, are the facts and circumstances of crime or crimes involved. court has to impose a sentence, and Mr. Goldfarb know this because we talked about this at his quilty plea, a court has to impose a sentence that is going to reflect the seriousness of the crime. That is going to promote respect for the law and provide a just punishment for the crime. Some of the letters that I received, and I do want to again tell you how much I appreciated the letters, the thought and time that went into them, but several said that the process should not be punitive, that it should be much more about rehabilitation and recognizing the need to give a second chance to the defendant. Here the latter part has to be part of the equation, but there is a punitive component to sentencing. There is a notion of just punishment that a crime that is serious requires punishment because that punishment is crucial to promoting respect for that the law. So that is something the Court has to consider.

So Mr. Tarlowe focused on the facts of this crime, which was not a spontaneous crime. It was a crime over many, many months with many individuals involved. The details matter. So that is something that the Court has to focus on

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24.

25

and cannot lose sight of even though obviously the things that friends and family members have to say are more urgent to them. The Court has to balance these other things.

Another objective of sentencing the Court has to consider is the need to deter the defendant and others from committing crimes like this in the future, both specific deterrence and general deterrence. This is something that courts have to take seriously. Sometimes it is hard to quantify general deterrence. It is very hard to know what effect a sentence on one individual on one day in a courthouse in New York is going to have on other people throughout the land. It is difficult to quantity. I think we all know intuitively that there is something to that that sentences imposed, particularly in cases that are being paid attention to, do have an effect. They do have an impact on others and sometimes on entire industries. That is a something the Court has to consider. Sometimes that factor weighs more heavily than in cases where general deterrence is not a major consideration, other cases where general deterrence is a major consideration by virtue of the circumstances of the case. that is something the Court has to take into account.

The sentencing guidelines are another thing that the Court has to consider. That is not to say that sentencing guidelines should be slavishly followed. They are not mandatory nor should they be in my view. Certainly no one I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

think could accuse me of slavishly following the sentencing guidelines. I depart below these guidelines more than 50 percent of the time more than most of my colleagues in this district. Look, every sentence is individual so I don't think that statistic means much, but I understand my ability to go below the guidelines and I understand the guidelines are just one factor to be considered. They are an important factor because the goal of these guidelines, the goal of the process of looking at individual crimes and applying objective criteria based on the amount of gain, based on other factors involved in the offense is to ensure that people who are similarly situated or roughly equivalent get roughly the same punishment. is something that undermines the credibility and the respect for which people owe their court system if sentences vary wildly depending on simply who the judge is, who the lawyers are or who is the defendant happens to be or know. That is something courts clearly have to take into account.

We've talked about these and I have taken them into account. I told you what the range is, which is under the guidelines 37 to --

MR. SOSHNICK: 46.

THE COURT: -- 46 months. It is a significant amount of time by any imagination.

Another factor I have to consider are the needs of a criminal defendant. There are many defendants who appear in

17.

front of me who have medical needs, substance abuse problems and other things that they need to be considered in fashioning an appropriate sentence.

The hard thing about being a judge is balancing all of these factors. If the only consideration were the defendant and his history or the likelihood of the defendant returning to crime, it would be easy. The only consideration was the impact that a sentence would have on a defendant's family. It would be easy. There is a reason why parents and siblings and spouses and friends are not asked to impose sentence on defendants. They can't. They are too close. They cannot put aside the obvious emotional connections, the obvious ties that they have to a defendant. The hope is that a judge who is unbiased, impartial will be able to weigh these different factors, balance them, to fashion a sentence that does justice to each even though there is often tension between and among the different objectives.

So that is what I am charged with doing. It has been a difficult task. I will not lie to you. It is something I thought a great deal about. I spent a lot of time thinking about it, reviewing the submissions, reviewing other cases and sentences imposed in those case. I will start with the defendant's personal history, the facts and circumstances of Mr. Goldfarb's life. It is a very long presentence report. It is 30 pages long as I mentioned. There are numerous letters in

this case, 60 or so. It is about as many as I have received in any case. It is not just the number of them, the quality of them. They are well written and very articulate. It is from people who are speaking from the heart. So I appreciate as I said this multiple times the time that went into those letters.

From those letters, from the presentence report

certain things are obvious to me. First, that Mr. Goldfarb was

and is a good son. There is no question about that. It is

heartbreaking to listen to his parents speak. Naturally this

has been overwhelming for them and I am sympathetic as a parent

myself. I can sympathize without understanding what they are

going through. I sympathize. There is no question he has been

a good son. He loves his parents and respects his parents and

he has treated them well. He hasn't done anything to shame

them up to this point and he has a been a model son. I think

that is worth noting. It is an admirable quality that will not

change after today. It will continue. And it is to your

credit, Mr. Goldfarb.

Another thing that is obvious from these letters is that Mr. Goldfarb is a good lawyer, a passionate lawyer, a lawyer who cares about his clients and who enjoyed the profession and who did well in the profession. I don't think there is any question about that. That is the truth.

Another fact that I don't think can be denied is Mr. Goldfarb say nice person. Certainly I see nothing to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

25

suggest otherwise. He has been respectful every time he has been in court. Today is no exception. More than that the people who know him speak to that quality again and again. Even the tapes, which are damning evidence of the crime, do reflect a person who is a decent guy on a personal level, someone who is likeable, who is charismatic, fun, who is nice. So I don't think anyone can dispute that.

Another fact that I think cannot be disputed obviously there are many, many people who care about Mr. Goldfarb. Almost unprecedented, perhaps unprecedented in any experience to have a sentencing proceeding attack this many people, this many people who wish to speak and address the Court, this many people who have been here all day, all morning because they care about Mr. Goldfarb and what happens to Mr. Goldfarb. That is to his credit certainly. What is also obvious to me is that those people and others who wrote letters, those are people who care about Mr. Goldfarb and are suffering. This is something that has been painful. It is obvious to me. It is not lost on me and it is something that is moving. It is natural to see that and want to help, want to do something to alleviate that I can understand that. It is heartbreaking to read the letters and hear people speak and certainly possible to be moved.

Again, this has to be put in perspective as well. The facts and circumstances of Mr. Goldfarb's life require the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Court to consider some other facts, which are first of all I sentence many defendants. There are many defendants sentenced in this courthouse and courthouses like it all over the country. Very few resemble Mr. Goldfarb in many different Mr. Goldfarb has had tremendous advantages that most defendants that I sentenced haven't had. That is a fact. think anyone familiar with this system would have to readily agree with that. Mr. Goldfarb had and has loving parents. From the moment of his birth, he has had parents devoted to him, sacrificed for him, made it their business and life to ensure that he had opportunities that they didn't have and that he would be able to reach his full potential as a man. That is a rarity in life. We all know that. It is more than a rarity in federal court. Mr. Goldfarb was blessed to have that. wasn't born a millionaire. He got something better than the lottery, he got parents who care. Not just care, I mean love him with a devotion that is hard to see and not be moved by it.

Another thing that Mr. Goldfarb has had is an education. Very few defendants who both have the aptitude and ability and the opportunity to get a quality education such as Mr. Goldfarb got from grammar school, high school and college and on to law school. That is unusual that a person with that sort of talent and that sort of opportunity to realize and take advantage of that talent shows up in federal court. Much more common than people who do not have the aptitude or worse don't

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have the opportunity to exercise that aptitude because of circumstances of their birth and lives. Mr. Goldfarb had that. That is a tremendous advantage.

Health. Mr. Goldfarb has had unusually good health. He has been able to play sports. He has a body that does what he tells it to. He is able to work long hours and still able to maintain relationships. There has been talk about the psychological report, which details test results as well as certain conclusions. I think Dr Kirwin for it. helpful. But the reality is there are many defendants who appear in this courtroom have much more severe mental health issues than Mr. Goldfarb, who have debilitating mental health issues that they are unable or unwilling to deal with, most cases unable because of their circumstances, and whose problems are such that even if they have the resources it would be difficult to deal with them because they are difficult, difficult problems. Mr. Goldfarb although he could have a drinking problem, he is not under the kind of addiction that is very common with defendants seen in this courthouse.

Finally, Mr. Goldfarb has a profession. Not just a job, a profession, a career. A career that entitles him to do something he enjoys. He does something that is satisfying, something that entitles him to make a pretty good living. It is a profession that carries with it prestige, respect and the prospects for more and more succes. He was good at it,

successful at it, he was moving up and he was assured more success. That is unusual. Material success can be measured a lot of different ways. Mr. Goldfarb, although early in his career had already achieved pretty significant amount of it. He was living on the Upper East Side in the neighborhood among the wealthiest zip codes in America. He wasn't a millionaire, but he was doing well. And as long as he continued to apply himself, as long as he continued to be ethical and law-abiding there is no reason to think that he would do better and better and he would not have a very comfortable life, perhaps even wealth.

To listen to the clients of Mr. Goldfarb's speak I am very confident this is a person who was going to be very, very successful in the law. It was a matter of time that he was going to make a good living at it and he was already making a good living at it on the grand scheme of it. He wasn't an investment banker, but he was making a good living. If he had loans, those loans were not insurmountable.

He also was part of a profession and that is something. That is something. Mr. Goldfarb has spoken about that. That is valuable. Part of that profession requires one to behave ethically and lawfully. It is a profession that demands ethical behavior from its professions. Mr. Goldfarb took ethics courses in law school. He had to take an ethics examine that he had to pass in order to be admitted to the bar.

He had to pass through a character and fitness examination in order to be received into the New York bar as part of the process of being admitted. He is required to take continuing legal education courses on ethics, a profession that demands ethical behavior and conduct.

Mr. Goldfarb I think in the grand scheme of things had advantages that most people don't have. Although many of the qualities we talked about are to his credit. There are decisions he made that were good ones. He earned and worked hard. It is important to remember that in assessing the crime and decisions made by Mr. Goldfarb. He was one of the lucky ones. One of the winners in life.

is the facts and circumstances of this crime. As I said the sentence has to reflect the seriousness of the crime and promote respect for the law. For many months -- this is undisputed -- Mr. Goldfarb was one of the leaders, one of the movers of a sophisticated scheme that was designed to steal privileged information, confidential information from a law firm and its clients to be used to make lucrative inside trades by hedge fund managers and traders. That was the goal of the scheme and that was the purpose of this scheme, to steal and to profit from it. Theft from the rightful owners of the information, breach of fiduciary duties and ethical obligations and enrichment of the insider traders at the expense of those

traders and investors who played by the roles who knew they were not entitled to trade on the basis of inside information.

This kind of conduct has consequences, consequences to the innocent investors who as Mr. Tarlowe said are not here who got suckered on the wrong end of an inside deal. In addition, it seriously and significantly undermines investor confidence in our financial markets. It breeds a cynicism that is palpable in this day and age. That is one of the things that came out of this case, it has demonstrated that this is a rigged game. It is not an illogical conclusion for someone to draw if they follow this trial and others like it in the recent past. There is a sense that sophisticated, powerful people are capable of bribing and stealing information that ensures them of profits. That is what this scheme was. It is about bribing and stealing. There is no way around it.

Mr. Goldfarb recruited Mr. Cutillo, his college roommate. We can quibble about how the conversations went, but the fact is it is a recognition that Mr. Cutillo had access to the information and that information could be valuable to Mr. Goldfarb's other friend Zvi Goffer. Mr. Goldfarb who encouraged those lawyers, Mr. Cutillo and Mr. Santarlas, to steal that information from their firm and from their firm's clients. I am not saying they were will was overborne. Far from it. They are guilty. One has been sentenced and the other will be sentenced. It was Mr. Goldfarb who willingly

shuttled that information to Mr. Goffer. It was Mr. Goldfarb who shuttled the profits back to the sources and kept a full third of the bribe as it were.

What went to the sources was split three ways, two-thirds to the lawyers inside the firm who got information and one-third to Mr. Goldfarb. This is a serious crime. It is a serious crime and it has got to be treated seriously. This is not a momentary lapse in judgment. It is not an impulsive act. It is not stealing bread when you are hungry. It is just not what it is. It is impossible to say that. Mr. Goldfarb in your letter to me, which was a thoughtful letter and moving letter and I say just this one point or suggest that. I didn't focus on the rest of it. But what you said in your letter is, For a second in a weakened state I made a horrible decision, and that is not quite accurate.

You made a series of decisions over a long period of time that had consequences. You made the decision each time. It wasn't an impulsive decision. It wasn't a compelled decision. You went on doing this for months. This involved a clandestine meetings, secret prepaid phones that were obtained for the express purpose of carrying out this crime and evading law enforcement. No question about it. You and the others, Mr. Cutillo and all the others involved, knew exactly what you were doing. You didn't hesitate for minute in carrying out this scheme. You expected to make a lot money and the money

paid out was not that great, \$33,000. But the plan was to make a lot more. The expectation was nobody was going to get caught.

There is no illusion this wasn't criminal behavior.

Everyone knew it was criminal. Everyone knew if you get caught disaster follows. You get arrested, you get disgraced, you get disbarred, you get financially ruined and you go to jail.

Everybody understood that but it didn't deter a single player in this process.

There is a tape here that Mr. Tarlowe alluded to in this record. I think it is worth playing the first recording. I think many of the people who spoke here today are not familiar with this case. There is no reason why I shouldn't, but this matters. This is what the conduct was.

Can you tee it up?

MR. TARLOWE: Certainly. Exhibit A.

THE COURT: Yes.

(Audio played)

THE COURT: This is February 2008. This is long after the first deal in the fall. This is obviously done with the expectation that they are going to be doing more deals and they are going to be bigger and they will make you and the other sources wealthy, hundreds of thousands of dollars. I don't think there is any question about that, at least not in my mind. So understanding the criminal nature of this scheme, you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and Mr. Goffer were undeterred. Deterrence is another objective of the sentencing. The Court has to consider specific deterrence. The goal of the sentence on Mr. Goldfarb is to make sure he doesn't commit crimes in the future. I am not worried about that one. I think most of you recognize that there is no need to worry about that. I don't think he is going to engage in this kind of conduct again. He has accepted responsibility. I think he is remorseful.

So I grant that but I have to say I do think this constant repetition of the motivation as oversimplification as to how Mr. Goldfarb got into this crime is a little troubling I think letter after letter basically stated the reason why Mr. Goldfarb got into this criminal conduct as though it was an isolated incident. And those who wrote the letters I am not faulting because you didn't know the facts and I think all you know is what you know from Mr. Goldfarb. It seems to me that on some level Mr. Goldfarb seems to have come up with something that makes it go down easier. This is an explanation that is easier to live with, but it is not the whole truth. There may be some truth to it, but it is a vast oversimplification and I think after a while letter after letter saying that it sort of felt like a campaign. like a lobbying effort to get me to buy a set of talking points.

Look, I don't think that Mr. Goldfarb is going to

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

commit additional insider trading in the future. believe that. It does suggest that there is a little something to be desired from his understanding of what took place here and his acceptance of responsibility. General deterrence is of course what is more a compelling objective of sentencing here. obviously there has to be a sentence, a message sent to a broader audience. Inside trading as I said is destructive, it does real damage and it is highly lucrative. It is hard to detect and it is hard to prosecute. For that reason, it is important that when it is detected and when it is proven and prosecuted that the individuals involved be treated seriously and the penalties be severe because you have to send a message to people that they cannot do this. They cannot do this and then when they are caught just come up with excuses or reasons why they should be exempt from the penalties that come with criminal activity.

The conclusion that has to be drawn here is this conduct will not be tolerated. There are people around this country watching what happens in this case and other cases like it. So those engaging in this kind of conduct, they have to understand they better be careful because when they get caught they are going to be arrested, they are going to destroyed financially, they are going to be disgraced, disbarred if they are attorneys or delicensed if they are some other kind of professional, and yes, go to jail. They are going to go to

jail. That is what happens when people commit serious crimes. They go to jail because that is how society expresses its outrage at certain behavior.

So in some ways I think, Mr. Soshnick, you may have done a disservice to your client and your client's family by suggesting it was realistic to expect that there would be a noncustodial sentence here. Mr. Cutillo was sentenced a couple months ago and he received a sentence of 30 months to the low end of the guidelines range. Mr. Cutillo who had his own serious family circumstances, he has young children with special needs, who are financially devastated by this and who will continue to be affected by this obviously could have made very powerful arguments for leniency, he chose a very different approach to sentencing. He said he was ashamed and knew he had to be punished and acknowledged that he had betrayed everything that he was taught as a young man and everything that he believed as a lawyer.

Ultimately Mr. Goldfarb took a very different approach. I don't know which was right. I don't know that one is better than another. It doesn't really matter. The sentence I am going to impose is not going to be determined by the strategies dealing with sentencing that lawyers or defendants need. Each of these men, Mr. Cutillo and Mr. Goldfarb, are a decent man. I think each was a good lawyer. Each has people who care about them deeply. Each has

·16

1.7

people that is going to be affected by the sentence imposed. They are just sorry for what they did, but nonetheless each engaged in a different crime. One can argue the relevant culpability of each, but the fact remains that to sentence one man to 30 months and the other to a noncustodial sentence I think would be an injustice.

If anything in my line Mr. Goldfarb has been more culpable of the two, although it was Mr. Cutillo that breached the duties he owed to his firm and to his clients. Mr. Goldfarb was a willing participate in this scheme and knew exactly what was happening and in fact is the one who introduced Mr. Cutillo to the scheme. To listen to these tapes as I have, not just this one but the others, it is very clear that Mr. Goldfarb as not merely a willing participant was an energetic participant. There is almost a giddiness on the phonecalls. There is a sense of what we're doing is dangerous and exciting and it is potentially lucrative and I don't think anyone can listen to these calls and come away and think that this was a reluctant decision made by someone who is faced with dire financial circumstances. It rings hollow.

So it is my intention to impose a term of incarceration of 36 months, three years. That is a long time. It is a little more than Mr. Cutillo, but for the reasons I said it is appropriate. It is a little below the guidelines. The quidelines I don't let drive a decision. I basically look

at a crime, look at the conduct, decide in my own mind what seems like a ballpark number and then I look at the guidelines to see we're roughly in the same ballpark.

MR. SOSHNICK: Your Honor, you are aware of the Probation recommendation was 24 months.

THE COURT: Do you for a minute imagine that I am not aware of that?

MR. SOSHNICK: Okay, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you serious, Mr. Soshnick?

MR. SOSHNICK: I apologize, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, I am aware of that. I am aware also the Probation recommendation doesn't seem to focus on many of the factors that I been spending the last half hour talking about. So since the responsibility falls on me to impose the sentence, I am certainly aware of the recommendation, but I probably follow the recommendation of Probation with the same frequency that I follow the guidelines. Respectfully I think they are valuable, but ultimately the decisions is mine.

My intention is so sentence Mr. Goldfarb to a term of three years' incarceration to be followed by a term of supervised release. That term of supervised release will be for a period of three years. It will include the conditions that I will go into in a moment, but are the ones set forth in the presentence report. I will impose a fine of \$32,500. As well as restitution in the amount of a little over one million

dollars set forth in the proposed order that was part of the stipulation at the time of the guilty plea. Restitution is not appropriate or applicable in this case. I will impose a special assessment of \$200, \$100 for each of the counts of convictions.

Is there any legal impediment to my imposing that sentence, Mr. Tarlowe?

MR. TARLOWE: No, your Honor. I think the Court misspoke and referred to it as restitution rather than forfeiture.

THE COURT: I am sorry. I did misspeak. It is a forfeiture order. Restitution is not applicable.

Mr. Soshnick, are you aware of any legal impediment to imposing such a sentence.

MR. SOSHNICK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Goldfarb, please stand.

Mr. Goldfarb, having accepted your guilty plea back in April, I now sentence you as follows: I sentence you to a term of incarceration of three years, 36 months. That is to run concurrent on each of the counts of conviction, Count One and Count Three. In addition, I am going to impose a three-year term of supervised release to run concurrent on Counts One and Three of the indictment. That term of supervised release will include the following mandatory conditions: You shall not commit another federal, state or local crime. You shall not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

illegally possess a controlled substance. You will not possess a firearm or other destructive device. You will cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by Probation.

There are standard conditions 1 through 13 that are imposed in virtually every case involving supervised release. I will impose those. I will also impose the following special conditions: First, that you shall provide the Probation office with access to any requested financial information. You shall not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the expressed permission of your Probation officer. will direct that you participate in an alcohol treatment program and that that program and your supervision will include testing by a Breathalyzer at the direction of the Probation officer or the treatment provider to determine whether you have reverted to the use or abuse of alcohol. You will participate in a mental health program approved by U.S. Probation Office along the lines of what you are receiving now. You will continue to take any prescribed medications, unless otherwise instructed by a health care provider. You will contribute to the cost of services rendered that are not covered by third-party payment. So to the extent you can defer the cost of those services, you will be expected to pay them. can't then the government will bear the expense of those It is important that you get the programs. I will authorize the release of psychological and psychiatric

evaluations and reports to the health care provider and from the health care provider to Probation. There is a free flow of information between Probation and health care provider.

You will be supervised in the district of your residence, which is for now Southern District of New York. I assume that will continue unless you move to Brooklyn or someplace. Let them know and you can transfer supervision. I am not going to impose restitution, which is not applicable. I will impose a fine of \$32,500. I will also order that you forfeit the \$1,103,131 that is set forth in the order of forfiture and the plea agreement. There is a \$200 special assessment, which I said \$100 for each count. That is the sentence.

I will allow you to voluntarily surrender. I will give you 60 days so the Bureau of Prisons can make a designation and you can report to that facility which will hopefully be a facility in the New York area. I will make that recommendation strongly. I will also request or recommend that you be at a facility that will enable you to take advantage of a substance abuse program. That will be up to the Bureau of Prisons. I will make that recommendation. The benefit of such program is that it could reduce your sentence and certainly will provide you with the kind of care that will be useful to you going forward. I will also recommend that you receive mental health treatment while in custody and that be designated

2 .

at a facility that can best provide those services to you. So

I will direct that Dr. Kirwin's report be made available to the

Bureau of Prisons so that they can take into account her

findings, recommendations and then tailor your designation to

your needs with respect for mental health treatment.

Are there open counts, Mr. Tarlowe?

MR. TARLOWE: Yes, your Honor. The government moves to dismiss the underlying indictment as well as Counts and 11 of the superseding indictment.

THE COURT: I will dismiss those counts.

Mr. Goldfarb, you have a right to appeal this sentence to the extent you haven't already waived it. If you wish to appeal you need to do so within two weeks from today. If you wish to appeal, talk to Mr. Soshnick and he will help you with filing the notice of appeal. The notice of appeal will need to be two weeks obviously. After that there will be a schedule for the appeal briefs. If you cannot afford to pay the filing fee, talk to Mr. Soshnick. There is a form you can fill out that will result in the fee being waived.

Mr. Soshnick, anything else you wanted me to recommend?

MR. SOSHNICK: Yes. I would ask you making a specific recommendation as to the camp at Fort Dix.

THE COURT: Camp at Fort Dix. I don't mind making that recommendation. Ultimately it is up to the Bureau of

Prisons.

MR. SOSHNICK: I understand.

THE COURT: I am familiar with that camp. It is open. It is close. It is a pretty good facility. There may be others that the Bureau of Prisons thinks are appropriate in light of the recommendations and other things they may have to consider. I will leave it to them, but I will make the recommendation.

Mr. Goldfarb, let me finish by saying this: Ms. Hart said you are a special person. I absolutely share that view. You are a good, decent person. This is a crime that has to be punished. I explained my reasons for this sentence. I think it is an appropriate sentence in light of all those reasons. It doesn't diminish my view that you are a person of talent, a person of quality. You are a person who has the ability and a great future in front of you. It may not be as a lawyer as a result of this conviction, but it certainly can and I think should include many of the qualities that we're talking about today, the ability to connect with people, the ability to understand what they are going through and to help them in a way that many other lawyers clearly didn't do in this case in their cases.

So don't lose sight of that fact. This crime does not define you. This crime was a bad one and a serious one. I probably find it more serious than you and others here today by

virtue of what they have been asking for. But it doesn't define you. There is much, much more to you than this. You will be released. You are a young man. When you get out, you will resume your life, you will resume your relationships and you will make something of yourself. You will continue to make something of your life. What happened here today doesn't discount everything you have done in your life. It doesn't.

You should be proud of what people said about you here today. It is true and it is not something that people say about everyone. You have earned it. The fact that you have to now endure this punishment, doesn't mean that you are not capable of great things going forward. It is my hope that you will have a happy life, a full life and a life that is worthy of your talents. You deserve this. Everyone in this room deserves that. I have no doubt the sentence I have imposed is one that is one that makes you unhappy, that you don't agree with what I determined here. But I think you do agree on what I said last, which is that you do have a future and it is a future that can be a great one if you want it to be. So I hope you will do that.

Thank everyone for coming here today. You may walk out of here saying you disagree with the sentence I imposed. I respect that. I hope you will respect my decision and the decision-making process. I hope as I said before at least you will agree that this was not a callus, reflexive or thoughtless

process. I put a great deal of thought into it. I did in my judgment what was the right thing. I hope you will continue to be there for Mr. Goldfarb. He will need you more or as much as ever. The fact that he will be separated from you for a time does not mean you will not still be important to him. A relationship is a two-way street. Prison doesn't mean it will end. They don't have to be destroyed. And in fact sometimes they will grow. My hope is that they will grow. I ask you to do your part. I commend you for it and I am moved by it, but I hope you will not -- let me put this way, I hope you will continue to be there. He is a person who needs it and he is a person who deserves it.

Let me thank the court reporter who has been working nonstop. Let me thank the lawyers. Mr. Soshnick, you put tremendous effort into this proceeding and that wasn't lost on me, Mr. Soshnick. Thank you for doing that. Thank you Mr. Tarlowe as well. With that, I bid you good day.

MR. SOSHNICK: Your Honor, thank you for all your time. I know you spent a great deal of time on this matter and struggled with it and we thank you for your words of encouragement that you just gave to my client.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Good luck to you, Mr. Goldfarb.